DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 208 212 CE 030 326

AUTHOR Marangos, Mary Anna; Thomas, Hollie B.
TITLE State Evaluation of Bilingual Vocational Programs in Florida.
SPONS AGENCY Florida State Dept. of Education, Tallahassee. Div. of Vocational Education.
PUB DATE 81
GRANT 01B31
NOTE 28p.; Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the National Association for Bilingual Education (Boston, MA, 1981). Best copy available.

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Bilingual Students; Educational Assessment; English (Second Language); Evaluation Criteria; *Evaluation Methods; Evaluation Needs; Postsecondary Education; *Program Evaluation; Research Methodology; Research Needs; Secondary Education; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Spanish Speaking; *State Surveys; Statewide Planning; Validity; *Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Florida; Limited English Speaking; Vocational Education Amendments 1976

ABSTRACT

This study was conducted for the state of Florida to develop a component of the Vocational Education Instruction Program Review (VEIPR) for evaluation of bilingual vocational education programs. The study was aimed at Spanish-language bilingual vocational education programs. Standards and criteria that would ensure an effective vocational program for limited English proficiency (LEP) students were first ascertained through a literature review and interviews with supervisors of 67 school districts and 33 community colleges in Florida. From this material, a questionnaire was prepared, field tested, revised, pilot tested, and field tested by vocational education administrators throughout the state. Respondents evaluated the instrument as well as provided data on the status of LEP vocational education programs in the state. Analysis of data from the evaluation provided further validation of the standards and criteria for vocational programs with LEP students enrolled. Participants in the study responded that LEP students enrolled in vocational programs have additional needs for staff, staff skills, supplies, and curriculum components as compared to instruction of only English-speaking students. It appears that this is the first state evaluation component that was specifically developed for the review of vocational education programs with LEP students. It is a process model that identifies what is, rather than the outcome or product. (KC)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED208212

State Evaluation of Bilingual Vocational Programs in Florida

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mary Anna Marangos
The Florida State University

Dr. Hollie B. Thomas
The Florida State University

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

/ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Hollie B. Thomas
Mary Anna Marangos

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

CE030376

Paper presented at the National Association for Bilingual Education Annual convention, Boston, 1981. This research was supported by Grant # 01B31 from the Florida Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education, Tallahassee.

State Evaluation of Bilingual Vocational Programs in Florida

The evaluation of Vocational Education Programs (VEP) has been a requirement of the 1963 Vocational Education Act as amended in 1976 and the Higher Education Act of 1965; both of these acts are major sources of funding for state VEPs. The 1976 Vocational Education Amendments (VEA) made specific reference in the evaluation of all funded programs such as special education, guidance, and bilingual vocational education (BVE).

In order for the state of Florida, Division of Vocational Education, to be in concert with the federal mandate on evaluation of BVE a component to the Vocational Education Instruction Program Review (VEIPR) was needed. This study was conducted for the state of Florida to develop an additional component for the VEIPR to be used when Bilingual Vocational Education Programs (BVEP) are evaluated.

The 1976 VEA defined Bilingual Vocational Education as:

> Training or retraining in which instruction is presented in both the English language and the dominant target language of the persons receiving training and which is conducted as part of a program designed to prepare individuals for employment....These programs are designed to meet the needs of the Limited English Proficiency (LEP) students who desire vocational training.

The LEP population in the United States has been characterized by a high unemployment rate and a large number of secondary school dropouts. This group also has "the tendency....to end up in entry level

skill occupations where employment is irregular and salaries are low" (United States Department of Labor Report, The Labor Supply for Lower Level Occupations, 1976).

The LEP population in the United States is composed of 22 major language groups, plus a large number of minor ones. The largest group of LEP minorities is Hispanic. Of the five million identified LEP persons in the United States, three million are of Hispanic origin. Hispanics have a school dropout rate of 45 percent in contrast to the 10 percent rate of the English speaking student. (National Center for Educational Statistics (NCES), Spring 1978). This dropout rate is relevant to the state of Florida for which this study was conducted, since it is one of the nine states in which 90 percent of the Hispanic population of the U. S. is located (NCES, 1978).

The Florida Department of Education Division of Public Schools (MIS Statistical Report, Series 80-15, March 1980) has identified 28,105 LEP students in the state. The statistics quoted were prior to the 1980 Cuban and Haitian influx. The effects of this influx, have not, at this writing, been officially tabulated, in order to establish the needs of the LEP population with reference to education. It has been estimated that from "80,000 to 105,000 Cuban refugees have settled in Dade County or just over its borders." (New York Times, April 19, 1981, p. 1). Furthermore, interviews

with vocational personnel by this researcher within Florida established that the new population would most likely have difficulty obtaining employment without adequate English communication skills and vocational training. The vocational skills referred to by these vocational personnel are those saleable in the region in which the new LEP population plan to settle.

The needs of the LEP student in vocational education are being met in several ways in the state. However, Florida has no official definition or policy concerning bilingual vocational education for the LEP student. Each school district determines how they are going to meet the needs of the LEP student (Kandarakis, Telephone Interview, April 1981). Some districts are providing vocational instruction in the target language, with limited English; others require minimum English competence prior to entry into a program; and some simply mainstream the students into the classroom. This has resulted in a diversity of programs.

The study to develop the BVIPRC was designed to answer the following questions:

1. What are the additional requirements for the staff of VP with LEP students in addition to those required for the staff of English Speaking (ES) students?
2. What are the additional facilities, equipment, supplies and materials needed for the instruction of LEP students in VP in addition to those required for the ES students?

3. What are the curriculum components necessary for the instruction of LEP students in VPs in addition to those required for the ES students?
4. What are the standards and criteria which, when met, would indicate that the program is providing the components necessary for effective Vocational Education (VE) for the students enrolled?

The data necessary to answer these questions were collected in three parts, (a) a questionnaire designed to identify the additional needs of BVPs as compared to traditional VP (with ES students) and to identify the standards and criteria which, when met, would indicate that effective BVE was being provided, (b) a pilot test of the BVIPRC which was developed from the analysis of data obtained during the administering of the questionnaire, and the revalidation of the standards and criteria, (c) a field test of the BVIPRC and its evaluation.

The initial programs whose staff participated in this study were identified through a survey conducted by the researcher of the educational districts in Florida. Vocational Directors or Program Administrators were interviewed in each of the 67 school districts and 33 community colleges in the state of Florida. Additional programs and staff were identified during the study by chaining. Since the total population--the staff in each identified program were requested to participate, the sampling procedure was eliminated.

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was developed by the researcher based on the information obtained from the review of literature, correspondence and interviews with persons knolwedgeable in the area of Bilingual Vocational Education (BVE). The questionnaire (QI) was reviewed by a panel of experts and revised as needed. The revised questionnaire (QII) was pilot tested outside the state of Florida to prevent contamination of the limited identified population. The questionnaire (QII) was revised as needed based on the pilot test results.

The questionnaire (QIII) that was administered to the participants within the state of Florida was divided into two parts. The first part identified the additional needs of VP with LEP students in the following areas: instructor skills, materials, equipment, supplies, facilities, and curriculum components necessary for the instruction of LEP students. The second portion of the questionnaire was designed to identify the standards and criteria, which, when met, would indicate that effective VE is provided for LEP students enrolled.

For this segment of the study, the standards and criteria for the state of Florida were utilized in conjunction with the ones identified by the review of literature, personal and telephone interviews, and correspondence with experts in the field of BVE. The analysis of data from the QIII was used in the development of the component for VEIRP.

The BVIPRC was developed in two sections, to correspond with the VEIPR for Florida, (a) self-evaluation and (b) on-site review. The initially developed instrument was reviewed by a panel of experts, revised as needed, and pilot tested by the previously identified staff of programs serving LEP students in Florida.

The analysis of data from the pilot test established the reliability of the instrument for interpretation and validity for content. The analysis of the data from the pilot test was used in making the changes needed for reliability of interpretation and content validity. Additionally, the Division of Vocational Education, Bureau of Research Dissemination,Diffusion and Evaluation, staff reviewed the pilot test version of the BVIPRC. Their suggestions were incorporated into the revision of the BVIPRC.

The revised BVIPRC (C II) was field tested by a new group of staff who serve LEP students, who were identified by chaining during the pilot test of the component. The field test was conducted in two parts; (a) the completion of the BVIPRC, self-evaluation and on-site and (b) the evaluation of the BVIPRC by the participants. The component was evaluated for reliability of interpretation of wording, validity of content and methodology. The respondents were further requested to identify additional methods that would improve the evaluation of BVPs in Florida.

Validity and Reliability of the BVE Standards and Criteria

The responses of the BVP personnel in Florida were employed to establish the validity of the criteria and standards that were used in the BVIPRC. The standards and criteria were initially identified

by means of the questionnaire (QIII) that was administered in the state of Florida to the staff serving LEP students. These standards were then revalidated during the pilot test of the BVIPRC. The procedures to the standards and criteria were also validated by the participants in the field test of the BVIPRC. These participants had not previously been included in the study and thus were not contaminated by prior exposure. The new participants responded to an evaluation instrument designed to confirm the objectives of program review as identified in Vocational Education in Florida Mini-Plan 1978-79.

The purpose of program review in the state of Florida is "an accountability system....to assist local schools, community colleges and area vocational-technical centers in improving their vocational programs. Programs are reviewed and audited/monitored to insure that vocational insturction:

1. meets the needs, interests and abilities of students
2. satisfies the requirements of the occupation of field in which training is given
3. meets the needs of the community in terms of the number of students placed in jobs
4. meets the funding and program requirements of the State Board of Education for operation of vocational education programs (Vocational Education In Florida Mini-Plan 1978-79, based on the Florida Five Year Plan for Vocational Education)"

Analysis of Data

Questionnaire

The first part of the questionnaire was designed to determine the additional needs of LEP students enrolled in VP. The areas that were addressed by this portion of the questionnaire were staff requirements, instructor skills, facilities, equipment, supplies, curriculum components and special materials.

Part I Additional Needs of BVPs

Staff

The participants were requested to express their opinions as to the appropriate ratio of students to staff in teaching BVE and traditional VE (English Speaking students) programs in the state of Florida. An average of the responses received from the staff of each school participating was computed and used to obtain a statewide average for each staff position identified.

The data were used to determine the number of students per staff member that the respondents indicated would be a minimum in order to determine if there was a need for additional staff in delivering a BVP as compared to a traditional VP by comparing the number of students that can be effectively served by each staff member. Table 1 shows that there is a need for additional staff when there are LEP students enrolled than when there are ES students.

The analysis of the data shows that the respondents perceived that nearly twice as many ES students as LEP students can be served by a monolingual instructor, the averages being $\bar{X}$= 15.8 and $\bar{X}$=8.8 respectively. The respondents perceived that the bilingual teacher could serve slightly more LEP students($\bar{X}$=9.3) than the monolongual teacher but also slightly less ES students($\bar{X}$=14.2).

The support personnel, paraprofessionals, guidance counselors, etc., were also perceived as being able to effectively serve larger numbers of ES students than LEP. An example was the English speaking paraprofessional who was perceived as effectively serving an average of 15.2 ES students but only an average of 12.4 LEP students.

The English as a Second Language (ESL) instructor was perceived as being able to effectively serve an average of 15.2 LEP students. The respondents perceived that there is a need for an additional vocational instructor and FSL to serve the same number of LEP and ES students.

Table 1

Ratio of Staff to Students Required in the Instruction of Limited English Proficiency Students as Compared to English Speaking Students.

	Staff Member	ES	LEP
1.	Vocational Instructor who speaks English only	15.17	8.83
2.	Vocational Instructor who speaks English and target language(s)	18.2	9.33
3.	Paraprofessional who speaks English only	15.2	12.4
4.	A Paraprofessional who speaks English and target language	14.0	12.2
5.	FSL Instructor		15.2
6.	Guidance Councilor who speaks English only	117.0	110.0
7.	Guidance Councilor who speaks English and target language(s)	110.[illegible]	102.5
8.	Occupational specialist who speaks English only	93.0	92.33
9.	Occupational specialist who speaks English and target language	71.5	71.5
10.	Community volunteer who speaks English only	11.5	10.0
11.	Community volunteer who speaks English and target language(s)	13.7	11.2

Staff Requirements, Curriculum Components and Materials

The data that provided for the identification of the additional needs for staff skills, curriculum components and materials for VE programs with LEP students enrolled was obtained from the questionnaire (QIII). The questions were designed to identify the additional needs of the VE programs with LEP students on a three point response scale of necessary, not necessary and undecided. A skill, component, material, equipment or supply was considered to be required in the delivery of effective BVPs, if a minimum of 60 percent of the responses, were necessery.

Instructor Skills

The data obtained from the responses were analyzed using a 60 percent minimum response to identify a skill as being perceived as necessary by the participants. Table 2 shows that it was considered advantageous by the participants for the instructor of LEP students to speak, understand, read and write the target language. Furthermore, the data showed a higher need for oral communication (82.5 percent response) than for written communication (77.5 percent response).

In addition, table 3 shows that the analysis of data suggested that it was advantageous for the instructor of LEP students to understand the students' culture in reference to attitudes toward learning, social structure and specific work stigma. A cultural skill was perceived as in the effective instruction of LEP students, if a minimum of 60 of the responses, were necessery.

Table 2

Language Skills Necessary for Instructors of Limited English Proficiency Students

Cultural Skills	Scale	Educational Programs 1 f	1 %	2 f	2 %	3 f	3 %	4 f	4 %	5 f	5 %	6 f	6 %	7 f	7 %	8 f	8 %	Total cf	Total %
1. The BVE staff speak and understand the target language(s)	N			2	50.0	1	100	2	100	1	100	8	88.9	10	83.3	9	100	33	82.5
	NN	2	100	1	25.0							1	11.1	1	16.7			3	8.3
	U			1	25.0														
2. The BVE staff read and write the target language(s)	N			3	75.0	1	100			1	100	8	88.9	10	83.3	8	88.0	31	77.5
	NN	2	100	1	25.0							1	11.1			1	11.1	5	12.5
	U							2	100					2	16.6			4	10.0

f = Frequency that responses were selected within the school
cf = The total number of times the response was selected by all schools
N = The skill is necessary for the instructor of Limited English Proficiency Students (LEP)
NN = The skill is not necessary for the instructors of LEP students
U = The respondent was not sure if the skill was necessary for instructor of LEP students

Table 3

Cultural Skills Necessary for the Instruction of Limited English Proficiency Students in Florida

	Cultural Skills	Scale	Educational Programs 1 f	%	2 f	%	3 f	%	4 f	%	5 f	%	6 f	%	7 f	%	8 f	%	Total cf	%
1.	The BVE staff is sensitive to students' cultural attitudes towards learning.	N			4	100			2	100	1	100	9	100	9	75.0	7	77.8	34	85.0
		NN	2	100			1	100							1	8.3	2	22.2	4	10.0
		U													2	18.7			2	5.0
2.	The BVE staff is sensitive to students cultural beliefs about social structure including family & authority figures.	N	2	100	3	75.0			2	100	1	100	8	88.9	7	58.3	7	77.8	30	75.0
		NN			1	25.0	1	100							4	33.3	2	22.2	8	20.0
		U											1	11.1	1	8.3			2	5.0
3.	The Bve staff is sensitive to cultural stigma associated with some words or expressions.	N	2	100	3	75.0			2	100	1	100	6	66.7	11	91.7	7	77.8	32	80.0
		NN					1	100					1	11.1	1	8.3	1	11.1	4	10.0
		U			1	25.0							2	22.2			1	11.1	4	10.0

Code:

f = Frequency that responses were selected within the school
cf = The total number of times the response was selected by all schools
N = The skill is necessary for the instructor of Limited English Proficience Students (LEP)
NN = The skill is not necessary for the iantructors of LEP students
U = The respondent was not sure if the skill was necessary for instructor of LEP students

Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies

As shown in table 4, the facilities, equipment and supplies necessary for the instruction of LEP students as compared to those necessary for the ES students were believe by over 70 percent of the respondents to be the same.

The following were offered as examples of statements made by the respondents who believed there was a need for additional facilities, equipment, and supplies.

1. Additional facilities for small groups to be served
2. Additional equipment for ESL instruction
3. Additional supplies for the ESL component.

Table 4

Facilities, Equipment, and Supplies Necessary for the Instruction of LEP Students

Facilities Equipment Supplies	Scale	Educational Programs 1 f	1 %	2 f	2 %	3 f	3 %	4 f	4 %	5 f	5 %	6 f	6 %	7 f	7 %	8 f	8 %	Total cf	Total %
1. The facilities	M	1	50.0											2	22.2			3	8.3
	L													1	11.1			2	2.7
	S	1	50.0	4	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	9	100	6	66.6	9	100	32	88.0
2. The equipment	M	1	50.0	2	50.0							1	12.5	2	22.2			5	14.3
	L			2	50.0							1	12.5					2	5.8
	S	1	50.0			1	100	2	100	1	100	7	87.5	7	77.8	9	100	28	80.0
3. The supplies	M	2	100											5	55.6	1	11.1	9	25.0
	L															1	11.1	1	2.8
	S			4	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	7	87.5	4	44.4	7	77.7	26	72.2

Code:

M = More
L = Less
S = Same

f = Frequency that response was selected within the school
% = The percentage of times the response was selected within the school or for all the respondents
cf = The total number of times that response was selected by all the respondents

Curriculum Components

The components necessary in the instruction of LEP students enrolled in vocational education programs and not for ES are shown in Table 5. A component for the improvement of English language skills and American cultural understanding by the students were considered by the respondents to be necessary for the instruction of the LEP students enrolled in vocational programs. The component for English Language skills was considered necessary by 100 percent of the participants. The need for cultural understanding was found necessary by 87 percent of those who responded to the question. The language component was identified as the most important additional component for the LEP students enrolled in the VPs.

Table 5

Additional Curriculum Components Necessary for the Instruction of LEP Vocational Education Students

	Curriculum	Scale	Educational Programs 1 f	1 %	2 f	2 %	3 f	3 %	4 f	4 %	5 f	5 %	6 f	6 %	7 f	7 %	8 f	8 %	Total cf	Total %
1.	Language improvement component(s)	N	2	100	4	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	9	100	2	100	9	100	40	100
		NN																		
		U																		
2.	Cultural understanding component(s)	N	2	100	4	100	1	100	2	100	1	100	8	88.8	9	75.0	8	88.9	35	87.0
		NN											1	11.1	2	16.7	1	11.1	4	10.0
		U													1	8.3			1	2.5

Code:
N = Necessary
NN = Not Necessary
U = Undecided

f = Frequency that the response was selected within the school
% = The percentage of times the response was selected with the school or for the total population
cf = The total number of times that response was selected by all the respondents

Special Materials for the Instruction of LEP Students

Table 6 shows that the respondents perceived that the instruction of LEP students requires ESL materials, bilingual audio-visual materials for the occupational area, and teacher translations of the vocational materials. In addition, the table shows that the respondents did not perceive a need for Bilingual or target language text books. The need for bilingual or target language textbooks was then analyzed in reference to the types of programs the participants represented; BVE and ESL. Table 7 shows that 61 percent of the BVE staff considered it necessary to have bilingual textbooks whereas 33.3 percent of the ESL staff considered it necessary to have them. The target language textbooks were not found necessary by either group.

Table 6

Special Instructional Material Needed for LEP Students

	Scale	Educational Programs 1 f	%	2 f	%	3 f	%	4 f	%	5 f	%	6 f	%	7 f	%	8 f	%	Total CI	%
The materials necessary for effective BVE programs, but not vor VE are:																			
1. Bilingual textbooks.	N			2	50.0	1	100			1	100	3	33.3	8	66.7	7	77.8	22	55.0
	NN	2	100	2	50.0			2	100			6	66.7	3	25.0	2	22.2	17	42.5
	U													1	8.3			1	2.5
2. Textbooks in target language only	N			1	25.0					1	100	1	12.5	8	66.7	6	75.0	17	44.7
	NN	2	100	3	75.0	1	100	2	100			7	87.5	3	25.0	2	25.0	20	52.6
	U													1	8.3			1	2.6
3. English language materials prepared for students with Limited English Speaking Ability (LESA).	N	2	100	3	75.0	1	100			1	100	9	100	11	100	6	66.7	33	84.6
	NN							2	100							3	33.3	5	12.8
	U			1	25.0													1	2.6
4. Audio-visual materials that are specific for the occupational training of the LESA.	N	2	100	3	75.0	1	100			1	100	7	77.8	12	100	7	87.5	33	84.6
	NN			1	25.0			2	100			1	11.1			1	12.5	5	12.8
	U											1	11.1					1	2.6
5. Translation of vocational material prepared by staff	N	2	100	4	100	1	100			1	100	7	77.8	8	72.7	7	87.5	30	76.9
	NN							2	100			1	11.1	3	27.3	1	12.5	7	18.4
	U											1	11.1					1	2.6

Table 7

Textbooks Required for the LEP Students

Materials	Scale	Education Programs			
		ESL		BV	
		CF	%	CF	%
Bilingual Textbooks	N	3	33.3	19	61.
	NN	6	66.7	11	35.5
	U			1	3.3
Target Language Textbooks	N	2	10.0	15	51.0
	NN	8	80.0	13	44.0
	U			1	3.4

Part II The Standards and Criteria Necessary for Effective BVPs

The standards and criteria, which, when met, would provide effective BVPs in the state of Florida were determined by three analyses. The first analysis determined the relevance of each standard to BVE. The participants responded on a four point nominal scale of BVE, VE, both or none. A standard was considered to be necessary for effective BPs in the event that BVE or both was selected by a minimum of 60 percent of the responses. For those standards identified as necessary for BP or both, the criteria were then rated on two scales.

The first scale being a five point interval scale of Strongly Agree (SA), Agree (A), Undecided (U), Disagree (D) and Strongly Disagree (SD), was used to determine the validity of the criterion for meeting the standard. IN addition, the respondents who selected SA or A responded to a second scale of "Both" (VE or BVE programs) or "BVP" only. This scale was used to determine if the respondents that agree that the criterion was necessary to meet the standard, believed that it was relevant in meeting the needs of all students or just the LEP only.

The criterion was considered to be valid for the standard if a minimum of 60 percent of the responses selected SA and/or A. For a criterion to be considered relevant to BVE, a minimum of 60 percent of the responses had to select BVE only.

The data obtained from the BVE review component were analyzed to determine the consensus and/or discrepancies between responses to the self-evaluation form of the teachers and the on-site review by the writer. The consensus needed to determine the validity of the standards and cri-

teria for BVPs and the reliability of the interpretation of the instrument was further examined through the use of personal interviews during the on-site visit and/or post visitation conference. The data from the BVE program review components were quantatative. Thus, the responses provided for the establishment of consensus and/or discrepancy on the specific item requested on the self-evaluation form and the on-site evaluation form.

The standards and their criteria that were identified and validated are included in the BVIPRC (see Appendix A) Criteria that were found to be invalid were included in the BVIPRC for the purpose of allowing those schools to be able to check off those procedures they were employing to meet the needs of LEP students. An example of these invalid criteria is the use of target language textbooks. All criteria which are considered to be invalid for the purpose of meeting the standards are identified with an asterisk (*) in the component included here as Appendix A.

The final analysis of date for this study was of the information obtained from the evaluation of the BVIPRC. The evaluation of the component was conducted to determine if the respondents believed that the BVIPRC meets the objectives of program review as specified by the state of Florida in its Five Year Mini Plan 1978-79, based on the state of Florida Five Year Plan.

The analysis of data showed that the BVIPRC met the objectives for program review specified by the State Board of Education, Five-Year State Plan for Vocational Education for the state of Florida. A

minimum of 60 percent of the responses had to agree that the objective had been met. In addition, the participants revalidated the standards and criteria, as relevant to the evaluation of BVPs. Table 8 shows the analysis of data obtained from the evaluation of the BVIPRC.

Those respondents who did not believe that the objectives were met made the following suggestions.

Evaluation Comments

1. Were the Directions on the Self-Evaluation form clear and explicit?

   Comments:

   Have one type of questions throughout the questionnaire. Remove the sometimes, never, always.

2. Was the information for completing the Self-Study Form clear and explicit?

   Comments:

   Simplify.

3. Were there any standards and/or criteria that you believe should be added or deleted from this instrument?

   Comments:

   Some sections could be subdivided for the vocational teacher and the ESL/IMT instructor.

   Standards and criteria are o.k., providing materials are available.

   The questions concerning administrative funding should be removed.

4. Do you believe this instrument will provide the following information:

a. Determine if the program meets the needs, interests, and abilities of the students?

Comments:

In certain occupational areas, the success can be determined by the number of students who pass licensing or certification examinations.

Students should be asked these questions when they have completed the program and their feedback provided to the teachers.

Speak to the students and check their exit competencies under normal conditions.

To obtain a better input, have students, present and past, evaluate the program for meeting their needs, interests and abilities.

Use pre-test/post-test to determine the English competencies of the students.

b. Determine if the program satisfies the requirements of the occupation or occupational field in which the training is given?

Comments:

To obtain better evaluation, have program evaluated by people in the field of training.

If reivewing an IMT lab have specific questions on areas of instruction being conducted.

Need Spanish materials.

c. Determine if the program meets the requirements set for it by the State Board of Education for the operation of vocational education programs and their related areas?

Comments:

One teacher was unaware if there were any standards for the programs for those students who desire to enter the vocational programs.

d. Do you have any other suggestions that would improve this information?

Comments:

Classes should use audio-visual materials.

Need for new equipment.

Instructors should be paid to attend up-dating skill workshops.

Provide additional funds.

Divide the instrument up to have a section for each--the administrators, teachers, support personnel (guidance, paraprofessional, occupational specialist, etc.) and students.

Bilingual Vocational/ Program Review Evaluation Data

EVALUATION

Table 8

		1 f	%	2 f	%	3 f	%	4 f	%	5 f	%	6 f	%	7 f	%	8 f	%	9 f	%	Total CF	Total CF%
1. Were the Directions on the Self-Evaluation form and explicit?	Yes	4	100	1	100	5	83.33	1	100	4	100	8	100	1	50	5	100	2	100	31	1.2
	No	0	0	0	0	1	16.67							1	50					3	8.8
2. Was the Information for Completing the Self-Study Form clear and explicit?	Yes	4	100	1	100	5	83.33	1	100	4	100	8	100	1	50	5	100	2	100	31	91.2
	No					1	16.67							1	50					3	8.8
3. Were there any standards and/or criteria that you believe should be added or deleted from this instrument:	Yes	1	25			4	66.67									1	20			7	21.2
	No	3	75	1	100	2	33.33	1	100	4	100	7	100	2	100	4	80	2	100	26	78.8
												1MD									
4. Do you believe this instrument will provide the following information:																					
a. Determine if the program meets the needs, interests, and abilities of students.	Yes	4	100	1	100	4	66.67	1	100	4	100	6	75	1	100	4	80			25	75.8
	No					2	33.33					2	25			1	20	2	100	8	24.2
														one no comment							
b. Determine if the program satisfies the requirements of the occupation or occupational field in which the training is given.	Yes	4	100	1	100	4	66.7	1	100	4	100	6	75							20	60.6
	No					2	33.3					2	25	1	100	5	100	2	100	13	39.4
														1 MD							
c. Determine if the program meets the requirements set for it by the State Board of Education for the operation of vocational education programs and their related areas.	Yes	4	100	Do not know		6	100	1	100	4	100	7	87.5							23	69.7
	No											1	12.5	2	100	5	100	2	100	10	30.3
d. Do you have any other suggestions that would improve this information?	Yes					2	33.3					1	16.66								
	No	4	100	1	100	4	66.7	MD		4	100	5	83.33	MD		5	100	2	100	4	12.9
																				25	80.2

Summary

Participants in this study responded that LEP students enrolled in VPs have additional needs when compared to the ES students. The areas that this study examined for the additional needs of the LEP students were staff, staff skills, materials, facilities, equipment, supplies and curriculum components.

The comparison of the number of students to staff that would provide for effective occupational instruction and services were perceived by the respondents to be smaller for the LEP students than the ES students. The respondents indicated that the vocational instruction--bilingual or monolingual--can effectively instruct approximately half as many LEP students as ES students. The ESL instructor is considered to be necessary for the instruction of LEP students. The support personnel, paraprofessionals, guidance, etc., were believed by the respondents able to effectively serve fewer LEP students than ES students. The number of students that can be effectively served by the support personnel was slightly less for the LEP than the ES, but did not appear to require additional staff.

The facilities, equipment, and materials need for the instruction of LEP students were perceived to be the same for the instruction of LEP and ES students enrolled in vocational classes. The respondents who perceived a need for additional facilities believed they were necessary to provide additional space vor smaller group instruction. These participants believed that the LEP students were effectively instructed in smaller group situations than traditionally used in their classes for ES Students

The curriculum components that were perceived as necessary for the instruction of LEP students and not the ES students were language improvement (English) and culture (American). These additional components could provide the students with the communication and social skills necessary for employment in their area of training.

Standards and criteria, which, when met, would provide effective VE for the LEP students enrolled were identified by the procedures employed in this study. The initially identified standards and criteria were reviewed by a panel of experts and revised as needed. The participants in the study then expressed their beliefs as to the validity of these standards and criteria to VE programs with LEP students enrolled.

The initially validated standards and criteria were utilized in the development of the BVIPRC to the VEIPR for the state of Florida. The component was then pilot tested and changes made as needed. In addition, the pilot test participants revalidated the standards and criteria for VE programs with LEP students enrolled. The validation was conducted by means of a one-to-one between the researcher and the respondent.

The revised BVIPRC was then field tested and evaluated by personnel that had not participated in the study before. The analysis of data from the evaluation provided further validation of the standards and criteria for vocational programs with LEP students enrolled.

It appears that this is the first state evaluation component that was specifically developed for the reivew of VP with LEP students. It is a process model which identifies what is rather than the outcome or product.

Reference

Florida State Department of Education, Division of Vocational Education. Vocational education in Florida mini-plan 1978-79, Tallahassee:

United States Congress. Educational Amendments of 1976, P. L. 94-482, 94th Congress, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1976.

United States Congress. Educational Act 1965, P. L. 89-10, 83rd Congress, Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1965.

United States Department of Health, Education, and Welfare; National Center for Educational Statistics. Geographic distribution, nativity, and age distribution of language minorities in the United States, 1979. Washington, D.C.: (American Statistical Index Reproduction Service No. 4566-5.2).